DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 333 EA 007 969

AUTHOR Mascaro, Francis G.
TITLE Early On-the-Job Socialization of First-Year Elementary School Principals.
PUB DATE 20 Apr 76
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Role; *Changing Attitudes; Elementary Education; Field Studies; *Models; *Principals; School Administration; Socialization

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the findings of a field study designed to develop a descriptive and explanatory model of the on-the-job socialization of first-year elementary school principals by examining changes in their initial perspective during their first year in the principalship. The theoretical model that emerged from the study indicates that first-year elementary school principals without previous experience as an elementary school vice principal or assistant principal generally come to the principalship with the expectation of being able to effect change by means of their personal involvement in the classroom. Several hypotheses developed from the study relate to the initial perspective of these first-year principals, the major problematic situation they encounter, and the new perspective toward which they move during their first year. The study indicates that this change in perspective is effected primarily by the requirements of the job itself rather than by interaction with alter role occupants. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED119333

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EARLY ON-THE-JOB SOCIALIZATION OF FIRST-YEAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Francis G. Mascaro

Lecturer in Administration
Graduate School of Administration
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, California 92502

EA 007 969

EARLY ON-THE-JOB SOCIALIZATION OF FIRST-YEAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS[1]

The beginning of each school year finds hundreds of newly appointed elementary school principals facing the challenge of their first year in the principalship. What is their perspective as they begin that first year? What is their conception of the role and of the activities which make up that role? How does their perspective change during their first year in the principalship? The purpose of the study reported herein was to develop a descriptive and explanatory model of the on-the-job socialization of first-year elementary school principals by examining changes in the perspective of first-year principals during their first year in the principalship.

Socialization and the Demands of the Job

According to Robert Merton, socialization of an individual takes place primarily through social interaction with people who are significant to the individual,[2] and the literature on organizational socialization tends to focus primarily on socialization as it is effected by the expectations of significant others. This study, however, was concerned primarily with the organizational socialization of first-year elementary school principals as it is effected by the demands of the job itself--that is, the demands of the activities required by the objectives, tasks, and responsibilities of the role such as the demands of day-to-day duties, the demands of daily schedules and work flow patterns, and the demands of teachers, pupils, parents, and the central office. The study

follows the body of research which indicates a change in perspective related to the demands of the work situation and includes such studies as those reported in Boys in White,[3] Functions of Student Teaching,[4] and "The Function of Experience in Professional Preparation."[5]

One of the primary objectives of this study was to discover possible conflicts between the first-year principal's concept of the principal's role based on occupational socialization prior to coming to the principalship, and the demands of the role as they relate to organizational socialization in the principalship. The conflicts were expected to manifest themselves as problematic situations and to lead to a change in the first-year principal's initial perspective. (The terms "perspective" and "problematic situation" are used herein according to their definition by Becker, et al. in Boys in White.[6])

Methodology

The study relied primarily on unstructured open-ended interviews with first-year principals for the gathering of data, and a design was used in which hypotheses were generated as the study proceeded rather than using a design in which variables, decided upon in advance, were to be located and their consequences isolated and measured. The absence of an adequate theoretical basis for selection of the principals to be included in the study made it meaningless to search for particular types of principals, and, therefore, the major basis for selection was availability.

Of fifty-one newly appointed elementary school principals located in three Southern California counties at the beginning of the 1972-73 school year, twenty-three were determined to be first-year principals. From the field of twenty-three, six first-year principals from five districts located in two of the three counties were selected for inclusion in the study. In order to reduce the risk of overlooking any effects which the socialization of an assistant principal or vice principal might have on the initial perspective of first-year principals, a first-year elementary school assistant principal from a sixth district within the two county area was included in the study. To facilitate data analysis and report writing, the following fictitious names were assigned to the interviewees and are used in the report: Principals Beth Anderson, Janet Baker, Ted Charles, Carl Diaz, Lee Edwards, and Alan Fisher, and assistant principal Ed Garcia. Prior to becoming principals, Mrs. Anderson and Miss Baker had been elementary school teachers, Mr. Charles had been an elementary school vice principal, Mr. Diaz had been the director of a federally funded program at the district level, and Mr. Edwards and Mr. Fisher had been junior high school assistant principals.

Four interviews were held with each principal (three with the assistant principal) with the interviews lasting from one-half hour to two hours depending on the interviewee's time schedule. The first set of interviews were held approximately six weeks after the beginning of the 1972-73 school year, and the subsequent interviews were scheduled at intervals from six to eight weeks throughout the school year. The interviews involved limited structure with no predetermined

sets of questions brought to the interviews. Instead, questions were allowed to evolve from the interviews themselves. The interviews were taped, and the total interview time with the seven interviewees was 30½ hours. Approximately seventy percent of the information on the tapes was judged salient to the study and yielded 226 double-spaced typewritten pages of relevant data, approximately seventy-five percent of which was transcribed verbatim and the remainder as paraphrases.

A Pervasive Complaint

Preliminary analysis of the interview data revealed that either explicitly or implicitly, the complaint of "not enough time" recurred in most of the interviews. Further analysis, however, revealed that the complaint was not simply a general complaint about "time," but rather a specific complaint found primarily, and in some instances almost exclusively, in the context of the principal's commenting on the activity of "getting into the classrooms." This pervasive complaint, labeled "not enough time to get into the classrooms," emerged from the interviews with four of the six principals, i.e., Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Edwards, and Mr. Fisher. It was absent from the interviews with Miss Baker and Mr. Charles. The significance of the complaint did not become apparent until the data were analyzed to determine what initial perspective the principals had brought to their first year in the principalship and what problematic situations, if any, they encountered.

The Initial Perspective

Of the six principals interviewed, Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Edwards, and Mr. Fisher came to the principalship with the expectation of effecting change through their personal involvement in the classrooms. Analysis of the interview data revealed that these four principals came to their first year as principals with an initial perspective made up of three major components:[7]

1. "Getting into the classrooms" is one of the most important activities of the principal's role.
2. Change can be effected by the principal's personal involvement in the classrooms.
3. Change should not be initiated until the principal has had an opportunity to become acquainted with "what's going on" in the classrooms and until the principal has been accepted in the role by alter role occupants.

An examination of the major components of the perspective reveals their interrelationship and their interdependence and suggests why "getting into the classrooms" was so important to these principals. The principals' expectation of being able to effect change through their personal involvement in the classrooms (the second component) requires that they have first-hand knowledge of what is going on in the classrooms (the third component); but to obtain this first-hand knowledge of what is going on in the classrooms, the principals must get into the classrooms (the first component); therefore, "getting into the classrooms" emerged as one of the most important activities of the principal's role for these principals.

The initial perspective described above did not emerge from the interview data for Miss Baker and Mr. Charles, and, therefore, these two principals appear as deviants to the general pattern which applies to the other principals. A discussion of Miss Baker's deviancy is given in Appendix A; discussion of Mr. Charles' deviancy is presented later in the paper.

The Major Problematic Situation

Following determination of the initial perspective brought to the principalship by Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Edwards, and Mr. Fisher, the data were analyzed to discover significant problematic situations faced by these principals. A problematic situation common to all four principals and of such significance that it emerged as the major problematic situation for these principals was "not enough time to get into the classrooms"[8]--the "pervasive complaint" reported above. (That the central complaint of the interviews with these four principals should turn out to be the major problematic situation being faced by them at the time of the interviews was, of course, not surprising.)

Becker's discussion of a problematic situation[9] suggests that a problematic situation is not simply encountered by an individual, it is created by the interaction of the individual's perspective (and especially the individual's expectations) with the situation at hand; and, indeed, the data from the present study suggest that this is so. The situation of "not enough time to get into the classrooms" emerged as a problematic situation for Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Edwards, and Mr. Fisher who brought to the principalship a perspective which included

"getting into the classrooms" as a major component; however, for Miss Baker and Mr. Charles who brought to the principalship perspectives which did not include "getting into the classrooms" as a major component of their perspectives, "not enough time to get into the classrooms" did not appear in the data as a problematic situation.

In order to fully appreciate the relationship between the activity of "getting into the classrooms" and the problematic situation of "not enough time to get into the classrooms," it must be noted that when the principals spoke of "getting into the classrooms," they were not referring to the common practice of elementary school principals of going in and out of classrooms for brief visits of five to ten minutes, but rather to the activity of getting into the classrooms for extended visits ranging from a half hour to an hour per visit which means that "getting into the classrooms" is a time-consuming activity. As indicated by the data, the demands of an elementary school principal's other activities do not permit the principal to devote the needed time to "getting into the classrooms." The resulting situation is one of "not enough time" to actualize the activity of "getting into the classrooms;" thus, for Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Edwards, and Mr. Fisher, interaction of the situation of "not enough time" with their initial perspective built around the activity of "getting into the classrooms" created for them the problematic situation of "not enough time to get into the classrooms."

The Principal and Time Demands

After the major problematic situation had been determined, the data were analyzed to discover what factors produced the situation of "not enough time" which interacted with the principals' initial perspective

to create the problematic situation of "not enough time to get into the classrooms." The data revealed that the activities mentioned most often by the principals were "meetings," "paperwork," "discipline problems," and "parent conferences."

At this point, the question arises, "Why does the situation of 'not enough time' become the problematic situation of 'not enough time to get into the classrooms' and not, for instance, the problematic situation of 'not enough time to attend meetings,' or 'not enough time to handle discipline problems,' etc.?" The answer lies with the answer to another question, "What time demand or demands on the principal can be compromised?" Analysis of the principal's control over the time demands of the five activities, i.e., "meetings," "paperwork," "discipline problems," "parent conferences," and "getting into the classrooms," suggests an answer.

In all the districts of the principals interviewed, district meetings, which appear to constitute the majority of the meetings these principals had to attend, were mandatory. As for meetings held within the principals' schools, the number of meetings of any significance at which the principal's presence was not expected was almost nil. Therefore, it is reasonable to infer that principals have very little control over the time demand of "meetings." As for "paperwork," most of the time demand comes from preparing reports for the central office which cover budgets, surveys, goals, objectives, and other like reports which are mandated by the central office; the routine office paperwork is only a small part of what the principals refer to as "paperwork."

Therefore, it may be inferred that principals have little control over the time demand of "paperwork." It should be noted that the time demands of two of the four activities which interfere with the principal's being able to get into the classrooms, i.e., meetings and paperwork, are determined primarily by the central office over which principals normally have rather limited influence.

The data indicate that handling discipline problems is an activity whose time demand principals try to control; however, in trying to control the time demand of discipline problems, principals must contend with teacher norms as to which problems "the teacher should handle" and which problems "the principal should handle." It would appear that the extent to which principals are able to control the time demand of discipline problems depends on the extent to which principals are willing to challenge the teachers' discretion as to what determines when a discipline problem for the teacher becomes a discipline problem which should be handled by the principal. It would seem that a first-year principal would not be overly anxious to incur a great deal of teacher alienation over an issue which involves sensitive teacher norms particularly at a time when the principal is concerned with being accepted in the principal role--a perceived necessary condition for initiating change (as indicated by the third major component of the initial perspective). Therefore, it is reasonable to infer that the principal's control over the time demand of handling discipline problems is very limited.

In the area of parent conferences, the traditional norm that "the principal's office is always open to parents" precludes the principal's having much control over the time demand of parent conferences. Principals, and especially first-year principals, are not usually predisposed to alienating parents by limiting their access to the principal's ear; therefore, it may be inferred that principals have little control over the time demand of parent conferences.

From the foregoing, which indicates that principals have little control over the time demands of attending meetings, taking care of paperwork, handling discipline problems, and holding parent conferences, it is now possible to arrive at an answer to the question, "What time demand or demands on the principal can be compromised [by the principal]?" The answer is quite clearly, "The time demand of 'getting into the classrooms,'" because this is one activity which does not arise from demands external to the principal; for Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Edwards, and Mr. Fisher, it emanated from their own initial perspective. Since these principals had very little control over the time demands of the four activities discussed above, it can be readily understood why the problematic situation they faced was one of "not enough time to get into the classrooms" and not one of "not enough time to attend meetings, or take care of paperwork, or handle discipline problems, or hold parent conferences." This is not to say that these principals indicated that they <u>did have</u> enough time for these other activities, for they indicated that they did not. However, the <u>situation</u> of not enough time for these other activities did not emerge from the

data as problematic situations for these principals whose initial perspective did not include a major component indicating that they considered these activities among the most important activities of the principal's role. This supports the inference of a relationship between the problematic situation and the initial perspective and implies that any resolution of the problematic situation must affect the initial perspective in some way.

The Change to a New Perspective

As already noted, one difference between the practice of "going in and out of classrooms" and "getting into the classrooms" is the length of time spent in the classrooms. Of greater significance to the study is the difference in the purpose of these activities. "Going in and out of classrooms" is meant primarily to keep teachers aware of the principal's interest in their classrooms; "getting into the classrooms" is meant primarily to supply the principal with information about the classrooms in order for the principal to be able to effect change in the classrooms. As discussed previously, in order to be able to effect change through personal involvement in the classrooms, the principal must know what is going on in the classrooms; and, in order to know what is going on in the classrooms, the principal must be able to "get into the classrooms" for extended periods of time. Thus, although it is expected that first-year principals who come to the principalship with an initial perspective which includes "getting into the classrooms" as a major component also engage in "going in and out of classrooms," when a principal begins substituting "going in and out of classrooms" for

"getting into the classrooms," this is tantamount to abandoning the expectation of being able to effect change in the classrooms through personal involvement of the principal and is an indication of a change in the principal's initial perspective.

According to Becker, "The immediate situation is problematic only in terms of the perspective the individual brings to bear upon it."[10] Thus, by changing from a perspective which emphasizes "getting into the classrooms" to a new perspective which does not emphasize "getting into the classrooms," the principal is able to cope with the problematic situation of "not enough time to get into the classrooms" by rendering it no longer problematic, i.e., it becomes merely a situation of "not enough time to get into the classrooms"--a situation to which the new perspective can relate without conflict.

According to the data, a new perspective begins to emerge as the principals begin to (1) de-emphasize the importance of "getting into the classrooms" and replace this activity with the practice of "going in and out of classrooms," (2) de-emphasize the principal's personal involvement in the classrooms accompanied by an indefinite postponement of effecting change in this way, and (3) de-emphasize the need for first-hand knowledge of what is going on in the classrooms and replace the need for first-hand knowledge with information from secondary sources. Final analysis of the data indicated that by the time the last set of interviews were complete, Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Edwards, and Mr. Fisher had changed or were in the process of changing from the initial perspective they had brought to the principalship to a new perspective whose major components include the following:

1. Reliance on "going in and out of classrooms" for brief visits more than on "getting into the classrooms" for extended visits.

2. Reliance on effecting change indirectly through teachers and teacher groups more than on the principal's personal involvement in the classrooms.

3. Reliance on secondary sources for information on what is going on in the classrooms more than on first-hand knowledge of what is going on in the classrooms.

The foregoing emerges from the study as an example of a change in perspective effected by the demands of the job; for it was the time demands of attending meetings, taking care of paperwork, handling discipline problems, and holding parent conferences which helped create the problematic situation of "not enough time to get into the classrooms" with which these principals had to cope. Thus, the data suggest that given the same parameters with respect to the demands of the job, first-year principals who come to the principalship with the same initial perspective will change that perspective to the same new perspective in order to cope with the problematic situation created by the interaction of their initial perspective and the demands of the job regardless of the particular alter role occupants in their respective schools, i.e., organizational socialization effected by the demands of the job more than by alter role occupants.

Teacher Expectations and the Change in Perspective

Although the results of the study indicate that the change in the principal's initial perspective is effected primarily by the demands of the job, analysis of the data reveals that teacher expectations with respect to the role of the principal contribute to the principal's

change in perspective. The third major component of the initial perspective is that "change should not be initiated until the principal has had an opportunity to become acquainted with 'what's going on' in the classrooms and until the principal has been accepted in the role by alter role occupants." Teacher expectations which call for minimum interference by the principal in the classrooms appear to frustrate this component of the initial perspective, and thereby the initial perspective itself, by presenting the principal with a dilemma. If the principal defers to teacher expectations and does not "get into the classrooms," then the principal will not be able to know "what's going on" in order to effect change through personal involvement with teachers; on the other hand, if the principal ignores teacher expectations and gets into the classrooms for extended periods of time, there is the risk of not being accepted in the role by the teachers. Thus, the data indicate that teacher expectations encourage the principal's change to the new perspective.

The Principal as a Change Agent

The major difference between the initial perspective and the new perspective is the issue of effecting change. The initial perspective views the principal as personally involved in change through working with teachers in the classrooms, i.e., it views the principal as a "change agent" in deed. The new perspective, on the other hand, recognizes that the principal is not only constrained by "not enough time to get into the classrooms," but also by other factors which limit the principal's activities as a change agent and leave the principal the

options of either effecting change indirectly through teachers or teacher groups or maintaining the status quo, i.e., it permits the principal to be a change agent in name without the necessity of being a change agent in deed.

Mr. Charles

As reported previously, Mr. Charles did not come to the principalship with the initial perspective held by Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Edwards, and Mr. Fisher. Analysis of the interview data revealed that the major components of the perspective which Mr. Charles brought to the principalship were the same as the major components of "the new perspective" toward which the four principals had moved or were in the process of moving by the end of the study. Further, the data revealed that Mr. Charles' acquisition of "the new perspective" was effected primarily during his socialization in the vice principalship and that he acquired the new perspective primarily from his former principal. Thus, Mr. Charles did not come to the principalship with "the initial perspective" but rather with "the new perspective." It should be noted that Mr. Charles' socialization into the new perspective by his former principal suggests that the new perspective may represent a major part of "the final perspective" of experienced principals.

Mr. Garcia

As indicated at the beginning of the report, a first-year elementary school assistant principal was added to the study in order to reduce the risk of overlooking any effects which the socialization of an assistant principal or vice principal might have on the perspective

of a first-year principal. (This decision was made, of course, prior to the finding that Mr. Charles' socialization as an elementary school vice principal socialized him into the new perspective.)

Analysis of the data from the interviews with Mr. Garcia revealed that he was in the process of developing a perspective whose major components were the same as the major components of "the new perspective." Further, the data indicated that Mr. Garcia was acquiring the new perspective from his principal in the course of his socialization in the assistant principalship. These findings reinforced the results from the interviews with Mr. Charles and also reinforced the inference that the new perspective may indeed represent a major part of "the final perspective" of experienced principals.

The data do not indicate the extent to which Mr. Charles and Mr. Garcia may have been socialized into the new perspective prior to their having assumed the vice principalship and the assistant principalship, respectively; however, the suggestion is that their socialization into the new perspective was effected primarily in those positions.

Acquiring the New Perspective

The foregoing leads to the question of Mr. Edwards' and Mr. Fisher's having come to the elementary school principalship without having previously acquired the new perspective as junior high school assistant principals. The data indicate that Mr. Charles acquired the new perspective in the elementary school vice principalship, that Mr. Garcia acquired the new perspective in the elementary school assistant principalship, and that Mr. Edwards and Mr. Fisher acquired the new

perspective in the elementary school principalship. Therefore, it is reasonable to infer that it is the elementary school principalship, i.e., the job itself, which provides the learning necessary to acquire the new perspective. In the case of Mr. Charles and Mr. Garcia, their proximity to the elementary school principalship apparently provided the necessary learning for them to acquire the new perspective. In the case of Mr. Edwards and Mr. Fisher, however, their proximity to the junior high school principalship apparently did not provide the necessary learning for them to acquire the new perspective, and it was only after they assumed the role of the elementary school principal that they acquired this perspective. Also Mr. Diaz, who had been a program director at the district level, acquired the new perspective in the elementary school principalship, and apparently his experience in an administrative position at the district level did not provide the necessary learning for him to acquire the new perspective.

Mr. Charles' description of his previous role as vice principal and Mr. Garcia's description of his role as assistant principal indicated that the roles were those of a general vice principal and general assistant principal, respectively. The study did not include data on elementary school principals or candidates for the elementary school principalship with experience in a specialized administrative position at the elementary school level. Also, Mr. Edwards' and Mr. Fisher's descriptions of their previous roles as junior high school assistant principals indicated that both had primary responsibility in the area of discipline; and Mr. Diaz' previous role was as a director of a

specific program at the district level. The study did not include data on candidates for the elementary school principalship with experience in a general administrative position at the secondary school level or the school district level.

Thus, the study indicates that the new perspective is acquired either in the elementary school principalship itself or in a general administrative position in close proximity to the elementary school principalship such as that of a general vice principal or general assistant principal, but not in a specialized administrative position at the secondary school level or the school district level. (Because of the limitations cited above, no conclusions were possible from this study regarding the acquisition of the new perspective in a specialized administrative position at the elementary school level or in a general administrative position at the secondary school level or school district level.)

A Model of the On-the-job Socialization of First-Year Elementary School Principals

The model of the on-the-job socialization of first-year elementary school principals during their first year which emerges from the present study indicates that first-year elementary school principals who have not had previous experience as an elementary school vice principal or assistant principal generally come to the principalship with the expectation of being able to effect change by means of their personal involvement in the classrooms. This expectation is quickly challenged by the problematic situation of "not enough time to get into the classrooms" which develops when the principals discover that the time which

they can devote to "getting into the classrooms" is limited by the time demands of other activities over which they have little control. The principals learn that the priorities they must give to the time demands of their most time-consuming activities are not dictated by the relative importance which they, themselves, might place on these activities, but rather by the relative importance placed on these activities by others, i.e., the central office, teachers, and parents; in fact, the exigencies of their situation rather than their assessment of importance determines where they spend their time. In order to cope with the problematic situation created by the conflict between the situation of "not enough time" to get into the classrooms and their initial perspective which calls for them to "get into the classrooms" for extended visits, the principals move to redefine their role by abandoning their expectation of effecting change through their personal involvement in the classrooms and by adopting a new perspective which calls for "going in and out of classrooms" for brief visits rather than for "getting into the classrooms" for extended visits. This new perspective is encouraged by teacher norms which call for minimum interference by the principal in classrooms. The redefined role and its accompanying new perspective have elements which resemble the original role and the initial perspective but without the time demands of having to get into the classroom; thus, the problematic situation of "not enough time to get into the classrooms" is no longer problematic. The implications of this redefinition include the following: (1) the principal relinquishes direct responsibility, although, of course, not

legal responsibility, in the classrooms to the teachers, (2) the principal relinquishes primary responsibility for initiating change in the classrooms to the teachers and to teacher groups, and (3) the principal reinforces the teachers' perception of the principal as taking care of "running the school" while they take care of "educating the children."

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed from the study:

I. If a first-year elementary school principal comes to the principalship with the expectation that the principal can effect change through personal involvement in the classrooms, then the principal's initial perspective will include the following major components: (1) that "getting into the classrooms" for extended visits is one of the most important activities of the principal's role, (2) that change can be effected through the principal's personal involvement in the classrooms, and (3) that the principal should have first-hand knowledge of "what's going on" in the classrooms and should be accepted in the role by alter role occupants before initiating change.

II. If a first-year elementary school principal comes to the principalship with the expectation that the principal can effect change through personal involvement in the classrooms, then one of the major problematic situations faced by the principal during the first year will be the problematic situation of "not enough time to get into the classrooms."

III. If a first-year elementary school principal comes to the principalship with the expectation that the principal can effect change through personal involvement in the classrooms, then upon facing the problematic situation of "not enough time to get into the classrooms," the principal will move toward a new perspective whose major components include the following: (1) reliance on "going in and out of classrooms" for brief visits more than on "getting into classrooms" for extended visits, (2) reliance on effecting change indirectly through teachers and teacher groups more than on the principal's personal involvement in the classrooms, and (3) reliance on secondary sources for information on what is going on in the classrooms more than on first-hand knowledge of what is going on in the classrooms.

Two correlates of the third hypothesis are the following:

III-1. If a first-year elementary school principal has had previous administrative experience at the elementary school level as a general vice principal or assistant principal, then the principal will come to the principalship with the new perspective (as described in the third hypothesis).

III-2. If a first-year elementary school principal has had previous specialized administrative experience at the secondary school level or the school district level, then the principal will come to the principalship with a perspective other than the new perspective (as described in the third hypothesis).

The Model and Supervisory Personnel in Other Organizations

The goal of the present study was to develop a model relating the events, processes, and factors meaningful in and to one sort of organization, i.e., the school, and, specifically, the public elementary school. There is, however, the possibility that the model developed in the study may be of value to other types of organizations. Indeed, it is not unreasonable to speculate that perhaps supervisory role personnel who come to their first year in the role with a perspective which includes the expectation of effecting change through their close personal involvement with subordinates and who encounter time demands from other activities of the role over which they have little control, move under pressure of the demands of the job to redefine their conception of the role and to adopt a new perspective which de-emphasizes effecting change through their close personal involvement with subordinates and calls for relying on effecting change through indirect means. The present study has not, of course, explored the conditions, parameters, or factors which would give support to such a speculation; however, the conclusions from the study may offer insight and leads for other parallel studies of similar occupations in similar organizations.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Detailed data to support the inferences and conclusions reported herein may be found in the author's doctoral dissertation, "The Early On-The-Job Socialization of First-Year Elementary School Principals" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Riverside, California, 1973).

[2]Robert K. Merton, George R. Reader, and Patricia L. Kendall, The Student-Physician (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 287.

[3]Howard S. Becker, Blanche Geer, Everett C. Hughes, and Anselm L. Strauss, Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961).

[4]Laurence Iannaccone and H. Warren Button, Functions of Student Teaching: Attitude Formation and Initiation in Elementary Student Teaching (Cooperative Research Report, Project No. 1026, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964).

[5]Ronald E. Blood, "The Function of Experience in Professional Preparation: Teaching and the Principalship" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California, 1966).

[6]See Appendix B

[7]The Study was not concerned with determining all the components of each principal's initial perspective, but rather with determining the major components common to the initial perspectives of all or most of the principals interviewed.

[8]Limiting the discussion to the major problematic situation faced by Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Edwards, and Mr. Fisher does not imply that Miss Baker and Mr. Charles were not faced with any significant problematic situations. However, in order to fulfill the purpose of the study, i.e., the generation of concepts and hypotheses relating to the socialization of first-year elementary school principals generally and accounting for differences among them, only significant problematic situations common to more than one principal could be considered for analysis. The problematic situation discussed in the report was not only common to four of the six principals interviewed, but it was also the only general problematic situation of significance to the study which emerged from the interview data. It was labeled a "major" problematic situation because it loomed so large in the data that it rendered any other problematic situations faced by these four principals of minor significance.

[9]See Appendix B.

[10]See Appendix B.

APPENDIX A

Miss Baker

Miss Baker's assignment prior to her appointment as a principal was as a "master teacher" in an intern program for new teachers in her district. According to Miss Baker, she had not seriously considered a principalship until she became aware that the intern program was about to be phased out. Shortly thereafter, when a vacancy was announced in her district, she applied for the position and was appointed.

Throughout all four interviews, Miss Baker indicated an ambivalence toward the principalship and said that she continually found herself "thinking as a teacher" and that she had "a hard time thinking in terms of a principal." The data indicate that she came to the principalship with the perspective of a master teacher rather than the perspective of a principal and that she maintained this perspective throughout the period of the study.

Although the interviews with Miss Baker do not include the data considered necessary to develop an explanation for her having come to the principalship without first having developed a "principal perspective," the interview data do suggest that perhaps Miss Baker's decision to seek a principalship only after she became aware that the intern program was being phased out may have combined with her ambivalence toward the principalship to impede the anticipatory socialization necessary to develop a "principal perspective" prior to coming to the principalship.

APPENDIX B

Perspective and Problematic Situation Defined

Becker and his colleagues define perspective as follows:

> We use the term perspective to refer to a co-ordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation, to refer to a person's ordinary way of thinking and feeling about and acting in such a situation.[1]

It should be noted that Becker speaks of a "co-ordinated set" of ideas and actions. Accordingly, the present study was not concerned with all the ideas and actions relating to the principal's role which the first-year principal brings to the principalship, but rather with the co-ordinated set of ideas and actions which constitute the first-year principal's initial perspective. The relationship between problematic situations and perspectives is given by Becker as follows:

> Let us explain what we mean by a "problematic situation" and what we see as the relation between problematic situations and perspectives. A person develops and maintains a perspective when he faces a situation calling for action which is not given by his own prior beliefs or by situational imperatives. In other words, perspectives arise when people face choice points.[2]

Based on the foregoing, the study expected to find problematic situations that arise during a principal's first year on the job and lead to "choice points" which call upon the principal for action not given by

---

[1] Howard S. Becker, Blanche Geer, Everett C. Hughes, and Anselm L. Strauss, Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 34.

[2] Ibid., p. 35.

the principal's initial perspective. Thus, it was expected that the principal would be required to develop a new perspective, or new perspectives, to cope with the problematic situations. Becker continues his explanation of the relationship between problematic situations and perspectives with the following:

> Clearly, a situation will not present the same problem to all people. Some will have a way to act in the situation so that it calls for no thought at all; the situation is not problematic for them. Others will perceive the situation differently, depending on their prior perspectives. . . . In short, the immediate situation is problematic only in terms of the perspective the individual brings to bear upon it.[3]

---

[3] Ibid.